



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

attendance after 16 years of age. "Any boy who is regularly and lawfully employed in any occupation for a livelihood shall not be required to take such training unless he volunteers and is accepted therefor."

"The virtue of a thing is in the application." The personnel of the commission is of radical importance. The major general commanding the National Guard of the State, General O'Ryan, is ex officio a member and chairman. The other two members are Commissioner Finley, named by the board of regents, and Dr. George J. Fisher, appointed by the governor. Dr. Thomas A. Storey, professor of physical education in the College of the City of New York, has been appointed by the commission as State inspector of physical training. The commissioners and the inspector worked continuously during the summer months and have formulated a comprehensive program for carrying out the provisions of the two laws; the schedule for physical training in the schools of the State as outlined in this program is as follows:

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

I. Grades 3A to 6B inclusive—

1. Physical training A: Correlation with school medical inspection, daily class inspection by regular class teacher.
2. Physical training B: A five-minute setting up drill at the beginning of each class period, or at least four times every school day, directed by regular class teacher.
3. Physical training C: Recitations in hygiene, two 10 or 15 minute periods a week, under regular class teacher or a teacher especially assigned to this work.
4. Physical training D: Organized play, one hour each day under the regular class teachers or special teachers, or both.

II. Grades 7A to 8B inclusive—

Same requirements as in I above, with the addition of:
Physical training E: Gymnastic drills and marching, two periods a week, minimum 30 minutes for each period, under special teacher of physical training.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

For all terms

1. Physical training A: Correlation with school medical inspection, daily inspection of every class by the regular class teacher.
2. Physical training B: Five-minute setting-up drills at the beginning of each class period, or at least four times every school day, under the direction of the regular class teacher.
3. Physical training C: Recitations in hygiene, two 10 or 15 minute periods a week, under the regular class teacher or a teacher appointed for this special work.
4. Physical training D: Organized play, recreational exercise and athletics one hour each day under special teachers of physical training assisted by other teachers in the school assigned to such work as a part of the regular schedule.
5. Physical training E: Gymnastic drills and marching, two periods a week, minimum of 30 minutes for each period, under direction of special teacher of physical training.

On four successive Monday evenings, beginning March 26, Dr. George Nasmyth, of the World Peace Foundation, will address the public sessions of the Boston School of Social Science. His topics are, respectively, "Justice and the Expansion of Life," "The Organic Theory of Society," "Social Consciousness and Social Will," and "World Federation and Social Progress."

FOR UNITY IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT

By Mrs. ANNA GARLIN SPENCER

[The following proposals, in the form of resolutions, were prepared by Mrs. Spencer for the consideration of and discussion by the combined peace organizations of America, as represented at the Conference of Peacemakers, held at the Hotel Biltmore, New York City, February 22-23. Since, by force of circumstances, their presentation was impossible on that occasion, we are glad to present them for wider consideration now. Mrs. Spencer will present to ADVOCATE readers in an early issue a more detailed statement of the possibilities and opportunities of peace unity.—THE EDITORS.]

WHEREAS, the Peace Movement in this country is divided into many organizations, thus causing confusion of the public in considering its appeals, and otherwise lessening its power of leadership; and

Whereas, in this time of anxiety concerning the relation of our own country to the world conflict, it is especially desirable that all those who are working to lessen the evils of the present war, to substitute law for war, and to organize the nations of the world in the interest of a just and durable peace, should unite for more effective effort;

Therefore, we, the representatives of the following named societies and committees, in conference assembled, hereby declare our belief and purpose concerning the better organization of the peace forces of the United States as follows:

We recognize rightful differences in the point of view of those within this conference as following in general four lines of approach to the common object of world peace, namely:

1. Those who are non-resistant, who under any and all circumstances are pledged to obey the Old Testament command, "Thou Shalt Not Kill," and to act upon the New Testament principle, "Thou Shalt Love Thine Enemies," and who therefore oppose all war and all preparations for war.

2. Those who, whether or not non-resistant in their personal action, believe it right, as a last resort, for national governments to take up arms against any enemy which invades the country, and who, although believing in the use of military and naval power for such defense of a nation's hearths and homes, would not use it for any other purpose, and are therefore strongly opposed to militarism, including the military training of the young.

3. Those who, while working diligently to build up international mechanisms and treaty relationships between nations, in order to substitute law for war, would not wait for attack upon our own shores before using military and naval force, but would repel all injurious actions directed against our nation whenever and wherever shown, and hence would have every nation amply prepared for defense against enemies as a duty of patriotism.

4. Those who, while also working toward a political and legal organization of the world, which shall establish international courts and conciliation councils and commissions of inquiry to lead toward the peaceful settlement of all international disputes, yet believe that international force is and will be needed perhaps always to give requisite sanction to world court decisions, and that hence, in this present time of war, the idea of force on

the side of peace should be held large and strong before the public mind, and the United States be ready to present in overmastering measure its quota of a world army and navy. The last two groups are subdivided into those favoring volunteer and those calling for conscripted armies and universal military training of youth.

The proposition before this conference has been of a "Minimum Program," a "Peace Creed" representing the lowest common denominator of belief which can be subscribed by all four of these classes. Such a minimum program, if accepted, might lessen the power of the Peace Movement by dulling initiative to a static conformity. We accept rather the principle of unity of effort with diversity of belief, such as is possible to those who have respect for others from whom they differ, and have also an ardent desire to work with those of all shades of opinion along any lines of possible agreement.

We are, therefore, at this solemn moment in the world's history and in the life of our nation, determined, if possible, to organize all the representatives of these four or any other forms of opinion, however widely held, among those who alike yearn for a final surcease from war, into a *federation of peace organizations*.

This federation we would have represented in continuous action by a joint committee, consisting of one member from each organization entering the federation, which joint committee should hold weekly sessions when public conditions demanded, and be pledged to regulate monthly meetings. We would have this joint committee use the headquarters of the oldest peace society in the United States, and the one now representing the most inclusive branch organization, The American Peace Society, with offices at our National Capitol, as a clearing-house of peace ideals and activities.

We would have one imposing peace publication into which the various "sectarian" peace magazines and occasional publications could be merged; a publication in which each one of the four general divisions of the peace movement outlined above could have definite and constant representation, and over which a joint editorial committee, under the unifying control of a competent managing editor, could preside, in the interest of just balance and many-sided interests. Each of the large and general divisions of thought and activity in the peace movement we would have use this common publication for distinctly propaganda appeal; not only for peace in general, but for the particular sort of peace movement each such division is trying to establish in leadership. In order not to make invidious choice of name as between publications already established, we would have a new name for this composite magazine—such a "merger," carrying always the names of its constituent publications' name on its title page—"The International" possibly being acceptable to all concerned.

The joint editorial committee supervising this publication should be composed of active members of the joint committee of management of the Federation of Peace Organizations, in order that the magazine should be a live wire stimulating to action, not a mere record of things done or of ideas accepted by either or all of the various groups.

We would have this publication weekly, and open to all manner of interpretation of current events from the point of view of the international mind. We would have it use the syndicate system for the wide diffusion

of such items, or of such articles as the editorial committee could agree in sanctioning, and send out as the united voice of the Federation. We would have its material of direction toward specific action (when a majority of the organizations represented in its management could issue one united call to the people) put into all popular forms of appeal at the expense of the Federation, and sent broadcast. All those of either division of sentiment and ideas using the magazine should also have the right to put into "broadsides" and circulars any form of special propaganda they desired to send out at the expense of the single society or group of societies desiring to use such propaganda.

For the better organization of local peace movements we would recommend the same Federation plan: We would have all united who are willing to so unite, under the name and mechanism of association of the American Peace Society, to give stability to the scheme; and all not so willing to unite, as branches of that body are loosely organized in a local Federation.

We state this suggested plan in the form of a desire rather than a direction, because we recognize the limitations of this conference, and because we can take no action but that of appeal to the bodies represented here, each one of which must pass officially upon all the questions involved. We do, however, urge with all the power of our united voice in this assembly, that the peace societies get together, and that they get together for action on points on which they are united; that they do not demand each of the other the surrender of independent autonomy, the suppression of special activity or demand a common belief as to ways and means of securing world peace; that, on the contrary, they make the basis of their union a friendly alignment for the spread of the various ideas represented in large degree in the peace movement as a whole, and, above all, that they unite to secure a scale of values in cooperative action rather than a common statement of principles. This scale of values in action should be at all times based on the democratic principle of numbers and weight on the basis of actual count.

First, those things we can all agree to press for put first and most prominent, and all together in a mighty chorus of appeal.

Second, those things we can all agree to press for by a majority vote, large and decisive, and so pressed by force of numbers, but with accurate statement of and due regard for the minority who do not desire to be included in that form of appeal.

Third, those things which a large minority agree to urge, and which the majority should of right and in wisdom give a fair chance of presentation in some common platform of high debate, in some federated forum of public print.

Fourth, and last, people who aspire to organize the world for peace and good will should be tender of the small minority, and give it friendly welcome and ample speech, understanding that all movements of moral reform have been from the few to the many, and that the very core and marrow of any great cause may be in those whose "over-emphasis" or whose "unpractical" radicalism make them unable to become anything but a voice crying for the perfect life here and now, as did One of old.

We urge this broadcast unity in diversity as the su-

preme need in the Peace Movement. We urge it in order that all who are determined that this shall be the last great war, and that the world may be relieved of the horrible burden and waste of wholesale human slaughter and the destruction of the riches of civilization in mad conflict, nation against nation, may learn how to live and work together, even as they desire all nations to do in the coming time. Peace workers of all people should have absolute faith "that above all things truth beareth away the victory," and can be trusted to verify itself in free debate.

We urge upon the organizations represented at this conference official action consistent with this statement, and calls for federation, and to that end we hereby appoint a committee, consisting of a member from each organization here represented, to address to all such organizations a specific program and plan of action looking toward the ends herein outlined.

PEACE AND ITS PRESERVATION

By JACKSON H. RALSTON

[From an address delivered before the Conference of Peace Workers, in New York, February 22-23, on the second day of its sessions, as revised for us by the author.—EDITORS.]

I VENTURE to take advantage of my opportunity and your helplessness to say a few words in calling this meeting to order. In the twenty-four hours I have been in attendance upon this Conference I have been told many things curious and interesting, and which deserve a few moments' attention. I have learned that the proper way to prepare for peace is to prepare for war. Being simply a lawyer, and having, therefore, no acquaintance with logic, I have been mystified by the proposition. It has seemed to me much as if one would say that the proper preparation for living a life of virtue were to take a course in vice. I have thought, furthermore, that it was quite like a suggestion that the proper way to avoid the evils of gambling were thoroughly to acquaint oneself with all the tricks of the game, so that when one met a gambler one would be well able to take all his money away from him and teach him how much better it would be for him never to encounter one who was so strongly opposed to this form of vice.

I have sometimes thought that the spectacle of war was so dazzling that it so filled the whole horizon and so occupied our thoughts and blinded our eyes that we were not able longer to understand the meaning of peace or the methods of its preservation. We have lost sight of not only the cruelty but also the crass stupidity of war.

Again, since being here I have learned, and in fact had so heard before, that we first took our place among the nations of the earth by defeating in conflict a second-class European nation in 1898. I had thought that the date of our taking our stand among the nations of the earth was not 1898, but that the true date was July 4, 1776; but I was mistaken. Somehow it had seemed to me that from the date I have just given the influence of the United States occupied a preeminent and striking place; that as a result of its advocacy then of democratic-republican government there had come about a tremen-

dous development of republican sentiment in France, and that such sentiment, impelled first by this country, had proceeded until, in a greater or less degree, it had had its vital effect upon the life of every nation of Europe.

When I turned to this continent, I found that every nation from the Rio Grande to Tierra del Fuego had felt the influence of our example, and for one hundred years had striven, often feebly, even blindly, to follow the lead we had given them, emulating our institutions and gradually becoming possessed of the genius that lay back of them. I had even seen, as I believed, our splendid influence extending among the nations of the earth to China, until that nation had stepped forth as a republic; but in all this I was in error, and it was necessary for us to join the nations of Europe, which set force above moral principle, before we were to be recognized as one of their equals.

We have now reached the point where we must consider the course we are to take in the present grave exigency. There are those who believe that the way to maintain principle, the way to enforce our ideas and gain our ends, is to exchange killings with Germany, and that the deaths of thousands of Americans and thousands of Germans will lead us into a purer atmosphere and clearer recognition of our rights as a free nation.

We must stop a few moments and review the past. We forget that the present situation is not nearly as grave or dangerous to us, all things considered, as was the situation in 1798. Then our commerce was almost driven from the seas by the action of France. It was quite necessary in those days that we exchange our agricultural products for the manufactured articles of Europe. Our ability to do so was almost destroyed. Then we were a feeble nation scattered along the Atlantic seaboard, and largely dependent upon the use of the ocean.

Now the situation is vastly changed. Our relative dependence upon the sea is evidently less than in 1798. We passed through a trying time then, with the result that no war was declared, that France acknowledged her wrong-doing, and granted us release from a treaty that should never have been entered into with her, and, in consideration, we undertook to pay to our own citizens the damages inflicted by French cruisers.

There was no more vital moment in the history of our country than in the sixties, when the studied carelessness of England permitted the *Alabama* and other cruisers to proceed to the high seas and raid and destroy American commerce. This came about at the moment of the highest national tension and inflicted a staggering blow, infinitely more serious in its consequences than anything that has happened between the United States and Germany. We waited, and a few years later England confessed her wrong, and an arbitral tribunal awarded in favor of the United States more than fifteen millions of dollars.

If we escaped the dangers of 1798 without a war with France, and escaped those of the sixties without a war with England, are we not justified in feeling that, if we are not blinded by the dazzling spectacle of war, today, under somewhat similar circumstances, we may well escape a war with Germany?